

As the setting up of a disposal centre for the purpose in the midst of working mines was likely to lead to leakage and pilferage of similar stores belonging to the other companies on the field,—chances for pilferage or leakage were prevented by timely action to acquire the assets for Government.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Will the Government be pleased to clarify further because the answer given is very cryptic and not analytic?

***Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.**—It happened like this. Oorgaum mine was closed quite a long time back. A liquidator was appointed to dispose of the machineries and some of the buildings. In October 1956, just prior to nationalisation, it was suspected that certain machineries were being disposed of. Some people felt on the Government side that machineries and equipments belonging to the other three mines may be disposed of and the new replaced in place of old and old in place of new machineries, because they were all stocked very near. Some action was to be taken to prevent it. In fact, there was writ petition in the High Court also that the police prevented the removal of the machinery, the machinery belonging to the sole proprietor. Government went into the matter and found that there was no question of any sort of what is called, sabotage or espionage or anything like that.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that such a report has appeared in the newspapers?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Yes; but it is an unfortunate thing.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Is it not true that at that time Messrs. John Taylor Sons informed Government that they were disposing of certain property and yet Government did not come forward to buy those properties?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—Before making the purchase, Government must be satisfied whether it would be necessary for them to buy and whether the venture would be profitable and all that.

Leave of Absence of a Member

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have received a letter from Sri M. Gangappa, a member of the Assembly, which reads thus:

“I regret to report that I am unable to attend the current session, which has begun from 12th July 1957 in spite of my sincere attempts, as I was forced to stay on here and attend to successive and repeated Court sittings before the Additional Judge and Sub-Judge, Anantapur in connection with a personal heavy suit. To add to that I am also subjected to illness in the intervals.

Therefore, I am to request you to be kind enough to grant permission to absent myself from this current session.”

In such cases Rule 178 (2) requires that permission of the House should be obtained. Hence I now put the question.

“Is it the pleasure of the Assembly that permission be granted to Sri M. Gangappa for remaining absent from the meetings of the Assembly?”

Permission was accorded.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Permission to remain absent is granted.

PRIVILEGE MOTION.

Re. A Member questioning the 'locus standi' of the Education Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri K. Puttaswamy has given notice of a Privilege Motion which is as follows:—

“That the persistent attitude and the statements of Sri B. K. Puttaramiya questioning the *locus standi* of the Education Minister in this House is in direct negation of the Constitution of India and also derogatory to the dignity of